

III. REMARKS

Claims 1-13 were presented for prosecution. Claims 1, 3, 4, 6, and 10-13 are rejected under 35 USC 102(b) as being anticipated by Chidsey (US 3,182,888). Claims 2, 5, and 7-9 have been indicated as containing allowable subject matter. Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter. Applicant has amended claim 1 to include the features of allowable claim 2; claim 4 has been amended to include the features of allowable claim 7; and new claim 14 has been added to include the features of allowable claim 8. Claims 2 and 7 have been canceled. Claim 11 has been amended to better clarify the subject matter contained therein. No new matter is believed added by the amendments presented herein.

Applicant does not acquiesce in the correctness of the rejections and reserves the right to present specific arguments regarding any rejected claims not specifically addressed. Further, Applicant reserves the right to pursue the full scope of the subject matter of the claims in a subsequent patent application that claims priority to the instant application.

In light of the amendments, Applicant submits that the only substantive rejection remaining involves claims 11-13. Applicant submits that claim 11 as currently presented is allowable over the art of record. The Office Action states that Chidsey discloses tabs cut from an edge of two opposing flaps or members having inwardly and outwardly projecting grooves. Applicant traverses this conclusion and submits that all of the tabs in Chidsey have slits that project “inwardly.” For instance, Figure 4 of Chidsey shows opposing tabs 20 and 21. Both of these tabs include inwardly projecting slits 65, 65a and 25, 25a, respectively. While slits 25 and 35 project outwardly from each other, these slits are not formed by a trapezoidal shaped tab cut into a flap. Instead, such slits are formed by an edge region 26, which comprises a cut-out region and not a tab. As Chidsey explicitly states, “edge portion 26, together with edges 24 and 34 and

slits 25 and 35, constitute a female locking element.” (See column 2, lines 45-50). Clearly, such a female locking element could not possibly be interpreted as a tab.

To further clarify this feature, Applicant has herein amended claim 11 to recite a structure wherein “the first member includes an edge with a first trapezoidal shaped tab cut therein, wherein the first trapezoidal shaped tab *projects outwardly towards the edge*,” and the second member “includes an edge with a second trapezoidal shaped tab cut therein, wherein the second trapezoidal shaped tab projects outwardly towards the edge of the second member.” In light of this amendment and arguments presented above, Applicant submits that independent claim 11 is not anticipated by Chidsey. Claims 12 and 13 are believed allowable for the reasons stated above, as well as well as their own unique features.

Applicant respectfully submits that the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that anything further is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant’s undersigned representative at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael F. Hoffman
Reg. No. 40,019

Dated: 6/28/06

Hoffman, Warnick & D’Alessandro LLC
75 State Street
Albany, NY 12207
(518) 449-0044 - Telephone
(518) 449-0047 - Facsimile